dispatch Lear and Cordelia in v. iii, and Lear's death in the same scene. Each sequence has a chapter devoted to it, which first explores possible stagings and then examines two actual ones.

The idea behind the book is valuable, but there are many obstacles to its full realization here. Bradley is cited in the opening sentence of the first chapter, and although the reference points out one of his misconceptions, too much of what follows is rooted in the same concern with psychological nuance that cannot possibly be depicted on stage. For instance, focusing on Lear's comment that he 'thought to set [his] rest | On [Cordelia's] kind nursery', the authors rehearse recent analyses of the scene as an inverted marriage ritual, with Lear determined to keep Cordelia in England rather than let her leave with Burgundy or France; in such a reading, Lear's division of his kingdom and the choosing of a husband for Cordelia 'are more than coincidentally part of the same occasion' (p. 31). To make that clear to an audience, the authors believe two stage props are crucial: the map Lear uses to divide his kingdom and the coronet Lear gives to Albany and Cornwall to part between them. 'The common presence of these properties and the relationship of each to the love test', they argue, 'affirm that Cordelia's betrothal is at least as central to the scene as the division of the kingdom.' While their discussion of the coronet (too often taken to mean Lear's own crown) is genuinely illuminating, the rest of their argument is ponderous and ultimately fruitless: if all had gone according to Lear's plan, Cordelia's marriage might have either seemed incidental to the kingdom's division or else given the actor an opportunity to demonstrate the personal motivation purportedly lurking behind Lear's political gesture. But here we are in the realm of a Bradleian 'if' instead of the Shakespearian 'what': precisely because the love-test collapses into the suitors' choice or rejection of Cordelia, the two rituals are connected in the audience's mind, but in a way that reinforces their sense of Lear's rejection of his daughter Finding a way to indicate that the coronet had been destined for Cordelia's husband is unlikely to provoke the thought that Lear had intended to disrupt Cordelia's betrothal for his own benefit.

In order to illustrate their ideas about staging, the authors end each chapter with a discussion of the BBC and Granada television adaptations of the play. They chose these productions because they are readily available for viewing, and there is something to be said for offering analyses which can be vetted against the productions themselves. However, the choice seems problematic on two counts Television versions beg too many questions about the intervention of the medium itself to provide sufficient illustration of potential stagings. Unlike Leggatt, who addresses such questions, Lusardi and Schlueter for the most part ignore them. In addition, the scenes are generally described in rather unnecessary detail and without adequate analysis of their strengths and weaknesses. While such treatment of ephemeral performances might provide useful information, here, where the performances are forever preserved, it is merely tedious. The book's lengthy appendix reprints many background articles about and reviews of the two television versions discussed, a handy resource for those using the productions to teach the play.

Royal Holloway, University of London CHRISTINE DYMKOWSKI

Macbeth. Edited with an introduction by H. BLOOM. Pp. xvi+260 (Major Literary Characters). New York: Chelsea House, 1991. $34.95.

Since the mid-1980s, when the first volumes of reprinted literary criticism edited by Harold Bloom and published by Chelsea House began to appear, there has been a gradual transformation in Bloom's work which has not so far attracted much serious analysis. This is not very surprising, given that even Bloom's central phase, beginning

with *The Anxiety of Influence* (Oxford, 1973), remains little understood. One of the notable features of Bloom's latest self-transformation is the importance now accorded to Shakespeare. For example, Milton's major precursor is no longer said to be Spenser, as in *A Map of Misreading* (Oxford, 1975), but Shakespeare—a more powerful, and hence more disturbing, figure for poets and readers alike. Bloom argues now that Shakespeare's uncanny originality is so great that we are unable, as readers, to see it: rather, it sees and determines us as irreparably belated (*Ruin the Sacred Truths*, Cambridge, Mass., 1989). Even Freud falls under the shadow of Shakespeare. It is appropriate, then, that the master of misprision should promise us a full-scale appreciation of the 'primitive lines' of Shakespeare, to borrow a phrase from one of Bloom's favourite poems (Wallace Stevens, 'From the Packet of Anacharsis', line 18).

The book under review is part of one of the many Chelsea House series which Bloom has undertaken: twenty-seven volumes have been published in the series as of February 1993, of which nine are devoted to Shakespearian characters, and more are due. This volume should not be confused with *William Shakespeare's 'Macbeth'* (Modern Critical Interpretations; New York, 1987), which is also edited by Bloom but which does not correspond to it at any point. Nor is there any extensive overlap between *Macbeth* and the recent Garland collection of reprinted essays on the play (New York, 1991) or the old Macmillan Casebook (London, 1968), for example. Bloom's *Macbeth*—which is mercifully free of the technical faults which aroused criticism in some earlier Chelsea House series—is concerned with the character of Macbeth, rather than with the play in general, and this concern has guided the selection of the critics. There are short critical extracts from William Warner and Dr Johnson to the present, and then the main body of the book consists of essays by A. C. Bradley, Wayne C. Booth, John Holloway, C. J. Sisson, Elizabeth Nielsen, Robert B. Heilman, Wilbur Sanders, Alan Hobson, P. Rama Moorthy, Carolyn Asp, Lisa Low, Kay Stockholder, and Barbara Everett (the most recent). A substantial list of suggestions for further reading is appended.

Many British and other libraries have not been able to keep up with the Bloom/Chelsea House projects, simply because of their epic size It would be a pity if the current series does not make its mark as a result. Students will use it if they can find it, and readers of Bloom will be intrigued to see him outlining what amounts to a new and Bloomian theory of character, in the general series introduction ('The Analysis of Character'). 'Character' for Bloom cannot be reduced either to a humanistic projection of presence and self-identity—as in L. C Knights's famous question, 'How many children had Lady Macbeth?'—or to the more literalistic structuralist version of character as no more than a written mark (pp. ix–x). Moreover, Shakespeare himself is said to invent the Bloomian notion of both character and character analysis, for instance in Macbeth's soliloquies. *Macbeth*, we learn from the introduction to this volume, is Bloom's choice for the greatest Shakespeare play primarily because of the centrality it gives to the poetic imagination and the critique of that imagination's devastating strength (p. 1). Readers familiar with Bloom's interpretation of Milton's Satan as the type of the modern poet now have to come to terms with the stronger and even darker figure of Macbeth.

The fact that the selected essays begin with Bradley, however, is symptomatic of a genuine problem. As Bloom knows, the Bloomian study of character does not yet exist, and until it does, characterology is inevitably circumscribed by Bradley and, behind him, Dr Johnson—whom Bloom has acknowledged as one of his strongest and hence most disturbing critical precursors. One can but hope that Bloom's truly idiosyncratic work on Shakespeare—his misreading of Shakespeare, in Bloomian terms—will survive the struggle with Bradley, Johnson, and Shakespeare himself.

University of Geneva ROY SELLARS